1 2 3 4	SEYFARTH SHAW LLP Kathleen Cahill Slaught (SBN 168129) kslaught@seyfarth.com 560 Mission Street, 31st Floor San Francisco, California 94105 Telephone: (415) 397-2823 Facsimile: (415) 397-8549	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Ryan R. Tikker (SBN 312860) rtikker@seyfarth.com 2029 Century Park East, Suite 3500 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 277-7200 Facsimile: (310) 201-5219 Amanda L. Genovese (Pro Hac Vice Forthcoming) agenovese@seyfarth.com 620 Eighth Avenue, 32nd Floor New York, New York 10018 Telephone: (212) 218-5500 Facsimile: (212) 218-5526 Attorneys for Defendants THE TRADE DESK, INC. and UNITED HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC.	
15 16 17 18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	RAYMOND JOHNSON, Plaintiff, v. THE TRADE DESK, UNITED HEALTHCARE SERVICES, DOES 1-10, Defendants.	Case No. 2:23-cv-02038 DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF CIVIL ACTION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 AND 1441 [Filed concurrently with Civil Cover Sheet and Certificate of Interested Parties] Action Filed: February 15, 2023
28		

DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF REMOVAL

TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-CAPTIONED COURT AND TO ALL PARTIES:

Please take notice that Defendants The Trade Desk, Inc. ("Trade Desk") and United HealthCare Services, Inc. ("United," together with Trade Desk, "Defendants") hereby remove this action from the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles to the United States District Court for the Central District of California, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331. Removal is proper because this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as well as supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). Accordingly, Defendants remove this action and, in addition, state the following:

I. BACKGROUND

- 1. On or about February 15, 2023, Plaintiff Raymond Johnson ("Plaintiff") filed a Complaint against Defendants in the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. 23STCV03344 (the "State Court Action").
- 2. On February 16, 2023, United was served with the Complaint and Summons in the State Court Action.
- 3. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), a true and correct copy of all process, pleadings, and orders from the State Court Action are collectively attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. Upon information and belief, no other related process, pleadings, or orders have been served.
- 4. Because United was served with the Complaint on February 16, 2023, and Trade Desk was served on February 16, 2023, removal is timely because this Notice of Removal is filed thirty days after the service of the Complaint, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b)(1) and FRCP Rule 6(a)(1).
- 5. Removal is also proper because both Trade Desk and United, the only named defendants (both represented by the undersigned counsel), timely consent to removal of the State Court Action to this Court.

- 6. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), a copy of Defendants' Notice of Filing of Notice of Removal is being filed contemporaneously with the Clerk of the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Los Angeles (*see Exhibit B*).
- 7. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), Defendants are contemporaneously serving this Notice of Removal on all adverse parties.

II. VENUE

8. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) because this Court is the United States District Court for the district corresponding to the place where the State Court Action is pending. Specifically, Plaintiff filed this action in the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Los Angeles (*see* Exhibit A), which is located within the Central District of California. Therefore, the State Court Action may be removed to this Court.

III. GROUNDS FOR REMOVAL

- A. Federal Question Jurisdiction
- 9. Plaintiff asserts one cause of action against Defendants for recovery of benefits under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. § 1132 (a)(1)(B). Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to properly adjudicate and reimburse benefits under an ERISA-governed health plan (the "Plan"). Plaintiff's sole cause of action under ERISA directly relates to the enforcement of rights and the payment of benefits under the Plan—the Plan does not fall within an ERISA exemption defined within 29 U.S.C. §§ 1002.
- 10. Federal courts have original jurisdiction over all cases that arise under federal law, 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and such cases are explicitly within this Court's removal jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b) (courts have removal jurisdiction for any action in which the district courts have original jurisdiction founded on a claim or right arising under the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States). Here, Plaintiff seeks "to recover benefits and enforce rights under 29 U.S.C. § 1132 (a)(1)(B)," making this entire case removable to this Court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Alternatively, and in further support of removal, the doctrine of complete 11. preemption confers jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which provides that the district court has original jurisdiction of "all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States." See 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a); Aetna Health Inc. v. Davila, 542 U.S. 200, 207–08 (2004) ("[W]hen the federal statute completely preempts the statelaw cause of action, a claim which comes within the scope of that same cause of action, even if pleaded in terms of state law, is in reality based on federal law: ERISA is one of these statutes." (internal quotations and citations omitted)). After *Davila*, the Ninth Circuit held that a state law cause of action is completely preempted if "(1) an individual, at some point in time, could have brought the claim under ERISA § 502(a)(1)(B), and (2) where there is no other independent legal duty that is implicated by a defendant's actions." Fossen v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mont., 660 F.3d 1102, 1107-08 (9th Cir. 2011) (citations) omitted). Notwithstanding Plaintiff's specific cause of action under ERISA, both prongs of the *Davila* test are satisfied here.¹ IV. **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS** 12.

- 12. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Plaintiff's Complaint and file this Notice of Removal without waiving any defenses, objections, exceptions, and/or obligations that may exist in its favor in either state or federal court.
- 13. Defendants do not concede in any way that (i) Plaintiff has asserted a claim upon which relief can be granted, (ii) Plaintiff has standing to sue, and/or (iii) recovery of any of the amounts sought is authorized or appropriate under the terms of the ERISA-governed Plan.
- 14. Defendants reserve the right to amend or supplement this Notice of Removal. Further, to the extent any questions arise as to the propriety of the removal of the State

For the first prong, Plaintiff alleges that he is a "'beneficiary' entitled to collect benefits." (Compl. ¶ 34.) With respect to the second prong, Plaintiff contends that Plaintiff's health plan is an ERISA plan and alleges a right to benefits under the ERISA-governed Plan: "Plaintiff seeks to obtain *proper reimbursement under the ERISA plan* to offset the cost that Plaintiff has incurred with Medical Providers." (*Id.* ¶¶ 16, 31 (emphasis added).)

Court Action, Defendants expressly request the opportunity to present a brief, oral argument and any further evidence necessary in support of its position that this action is removable.

WHEREFORE, in accordance with the authorities set forth above, Defendants hereby remove this action from the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles to the United States District Court for the Central District of California, and requests such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate and just.

DATED: March 17, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP

By:/s/ Kathleen Cahill Slaught

Kathleen Cahill Slaught Ryan R. Tikker Amanda L. Genovese (*Pro Hac Vice Forthcoming*)

Attorneys for Defendants THE TRADE DESK, INC. and UNITED HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC.